

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF ILLINOIS

MICHAEL A. PETERSON,

Plaintiff,

vs.

MICHAEL W. DUNLAP, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. 13-cv-1048-SMY-PMF

MEMORANDUM AND ORDER

This matter comes before the Court on the Report and Recommendation (“Report”) (Doc. 44) of Magistrate Judge Philip M. Frazier recommending this Court deny Plaintiff Michael Peterson’s Motion (“Amended Complaint”) for Preliminary Restraining Order and for Temporary and Permanent Injunction (Doc. 35). Judge Frazier construed this as a Motion for Reconsideration due to Plaintiff seeking the same relief on substantially similar grounds as in his first Motion for Injunctive Relief (Doc. 22).

The Court may accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations of the magistrate judge in a report and recommendation. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3). The Court must review *de novo* the portions of the report to which objections are made. The Court has discretion to conduct a new hearing and may consider the record before the magistrate judge anew or receive any further evidence deemed necessary. *Id.* “If no objection or only partial objection is made, the district court judge reviews those unobjected portions for clear error.” *Johnson v. Zema Sys. Corp.*, 170 F.3d 734, 739 (7th Cir. 1999).

The Court has received no objection to Judge Frazier’s Report. The Court has reviewed the entire file and finds that the Report is not clearly erroneous. Accordingly, the Court **ADOPTS** the Report (Doc. 44) and **DENIES** Plaintiff’s request for reconsideration of his Motion for injunctive relief (Doc. 35).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: January 28, 2015

s/ Staci M. Yandle
STACI M. YANDLE
DISTRICT JUDGE